that they (prostate glands) were the cause of patient's condition.

Mr. ——— of Soledad, California, testified that several months ago he had gone to the defendant. Wong examined him and told him he had gonorrhea. He further testified that Wong treated him over a period of several weeks for which Wong charged $30 a week and that he paid Wong a total of $315 for said treatment.

B——— further testified that, prior to going to Wong, he had been examined by Doctor Chase of Soledad, and Doctor Chase had found no trace of a gonorrhea condition. After going to Wong for many weeks, he spent four days in the University of California Hospital in San Francisco, where urology specialists made thorough examinations and were unable to find any trace of gonorrhea, but that he had a bladder condition which was entirely divorced from a social disease.

B——— did not state as to why he happened to go to Wong in the first place, but did state that his reason for spending so much money with Wong was due to the latter's convincing argument.

The defendant then took the witness stand on his own behalf and virtually admitted everything of which he had been accused. The only part of the evidence against him that he denied was the part that showed he had felt the patient's pulse. He claimed to only shake hands. However, he admitted treating ——— for gonorrhea, prescribing and treating the other patient, who had testified and admitted that he had told the undersigned that his ureters were prostate glands which were infected and causing a serious condition.

At the end of Mr. Wong's testimony, the defense rested its case.

In addition to the testimony of four witnesses, all of which was corroborated by other witnesses and by stipulation, we had a large supply of evidence, which is included in the memorandum of evidence and testimony, produced at the trial, which is attached herewith and is too lengthy to include in another report.

Subsequent to arguments by counsel and instructions given by the judge, the case went to the jury and it was remarked by both the judge and the defense attorney that the jury would return a verdict of guilty. It was further stated by the judge that if they did not find the defendant guilty, it would not be because of lack of evidence, but because "they don't want to." The defense attorney said that the best he could hope for was a disagreement. However, I think we were all quite surprised at 9:30 that evening when the jury brought a verdict of not guilty.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH W. WILLIAMS,
Assistant Special Agent.

Subject: Pacific Science Congress.

(COPY)

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Washington, D. C.,
April 3, 1939.

To the Editor:—It may be recalled that since 1920 there has been held in several countries of the Pacific region a series of Pacific Science Congresses of which the fifth was held in 1933 at Victoria and Vancouver, British Columbia, under the auspices of the National Research Council of Canada.

It has recently been determined to hold the sixth congress of this series in the United States of America in 1939, under the general auspices of the National Research Council, and I am happy, on behalf of the Council, to extend to the California Medical Association a cordial invitation to participate in the Congress by the appointment of a number of its members as representatives on this occasion. We shall be appreciative if you will let the Research Council know, when convenient, who these representatives are to be.

The Congress will take place in San Francisco and vicinity between the dates July 24 and August 12, 1939. Certain sessions of the Congress will be held in Pacific House of the Golden Gate International Exposition through the courtesy of the Exposition authorities. Other sessions of the Congress will be held on the grounds of Stanford University, near Palo Alto, and of the University of California at Berkeley, by courtesy of the authorities of these institutions.

Information concerning present plans for the Congress will be provided in advance announcements to be issued by the Council or by the Council's Committee on the Sixth Pacific Science Congress, of which Dean Charles B. Lipman of the University of California at Berkeley is the chairman.

We hope that word concerning the Congress can be given to the membership of the California Medical Association as widely as opportunity may afford, and that the interests of the Association in scientific problems of the Pacific region can be fully represented at the Congress both in the number of members who may attend and in contributions to the program.

2101 Constitution Avenue.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS G. HARRISON, *Chairman.*

Subject: Use of deceased licentiate's name.

San Francisco, California.
March 28, 1939.

To the Editor:—We thought perhaps the readers of the JOURNAL might be interested in the enclosed opinion (NS1550), dated San Francisco, March 23, 1939, rendered by the Attorney-General, advising that the use of the name of a deceased licentiate is illegal.

Very truly yours,

C. B. PINKHAM, M. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

(COPY)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

San Francisco, March 23, 1939.

Charles B. Pinkham, M. D.
Secreary-Treasurer
Board of Medical Examiners
San Francisco, California.

Dear Sir:

I have your communication asking whether, in the opinion of this office, a physician may legally use the name of a deceased physician and surgeon.

In reply, this office is of the view no person may use a name other than his own in connection with the announcement of or actual practice of medicine or surgery.

Section 2393 of the Business and Professions Code reads as follows and covers the question asked by you:

> The use of any fictitious name, or any name other than his own, by the holder of any certificate in any sign or advertisement in connection with his practice or in any advertisement or announcement of his practice constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter.

In the case entitled *People* vs. *Wilkes,* 163, N. Y. S. 659, a licensed physician advertised under the designation "Russian Medical Help. First Consultation Free." The New York law prohibited persons from practicing or advertising to practice under a name other than their own, in much the same language as does our statute.

The Court indicated that the purpose of the statute was to "effect definite identification of the practitioner, so as to prevent injury by fixing responsibility, which may be ac-